

Sabbath-Temple-Eden

Purity Rituals at the Intersection of Sacred Time and Space

Yonatan S. Miller (The University of Toledo)¹

Despite repeated biblical mentions of the sanctity of the Sabbath and numerous imperatives to keep the day holy, there is little in rabbinic writings on the Sabbath reflecting these facets of the day's observance. In contrast, Jewish writers from the Second Temple period and members of the Samaritan-Israelites actively sanctified the Sabbath by maintaining the day in a state of ritual purity. In this article, I reassess the exegetical and theological origins of this latter practice. I illustrate how non-rabbinic writers were attuned to the web of biblical connections between Sabbath, Tabernacle/Temple, and Eden, which they understood as bringing the Sabbath into the realm of cultic law. Just as access to the Temple demanded the ritual purity of the entrant, so too entering the Sabbath day. This "spatialization" of ritual time coheres with other known extensions of the domain of Temple laws. With these findings as a backdrop, I present the previously unexplained ritual purity tangents attested in Mishnah Shabbat as both responding to, and dismissing, the sectarian practice. This move coheres with an additional phenomenon, whereby the rabbis systematically disengaged the imperative to sanctify the Sabbath from the people. Whereas Jewish theologians see in the rabbinic Sabbath a temporal Temple, such an understanding is foreign to rabbinic literature and instead finds its best articulation in sectarian sources.

I. Introduction

"Sanctity" frequently features alongside biblical mentions of the Sabbath. Yet in writings on the Sabbath in classical rabbinic literature, the transcendent sense of this sanctity is nowhere to be found. Indeed, the imperative to sanctify the Sabbath is, most famously, channelled into the ritual of reciting the "*qiddush*" (lit. "sanctification") over wine. More generally, in the rabbinic mind the sanctity of the Sabbath is maintained, albeit passively, by refraining from forbidden labors – acts that would "desecrate" the Sabbath.

In this essay, I contextualize and shed new light on ancient Jewish approaches toward the sanctification of the Sabbath. Drawing on a critical reading of biblical sources, I demonstrate how the sanctity of the Sabbath was understood quite literally in a number of compositions from the Second Temple

1 Much of the work on this article was completed when I was a Harry Starr Fellow in Judaica in the year 2015–2016, and I am grateful to Harvard's Center for Jewish Studies for its support. Various versions of the manuscript were read and critiqued by my colleagues, and I thank Shaye J.D. Cohen, Erez DeGolan, Matthew Hass, Reuven Kimelman, and Sara Ronis for their comments and criticisms. I am particularly grateful to Alex Jassen and to the anonymous reader for the *Journal of Ancient Judaism* for their generous and incisive remarks on earlier versions of the essay. My arguments have been greatly enhanced as a result, but needless to say, all remaining errors are mine.

period. I contend that certain groups actively sanctified the Sabbath by mandating that a state of ritual purity be maintained throughout the Sabbath day. This practice derives not only from a strong reading of the scriptural imperative to keep the Sabbath holy, but from a Temple- and cult-centric reading of biblical Sabbath texts as well. With these findings as a backdrop, I illustrate how rabbinic sources also posit a relationship between Sabbath and Temple, yet play down the imperative to sanctify the Sabbath through ritual purification. Despite this latter move, however, my research reveals previously unappreciated vestiges of this practice in rabbinic texts.

Emerging from this examination is a novel understanding of the relationship between sacred time and sacred space in certain ancient Jewish writings. By extending the purity laws of the Temple to the Sabbath, the sectarians “spatialized” the notion of sacred time.² Moreover, while the connection between Sabbath and Temple has been long recognized in modern theological writings on the Sabbath, I contend that this idea is not a mere abstraction. Indeed, it was imbued with practical-ritual meaning. In the same way that entry into the Temple precincts required one’s ritual purification, the same criterion was in place for “entering” the Sabbath.

-
- 2 While Jared Calaway likewise speaks of the “templizing” of the Sabbath (46) and the “temporalizing of the Temple” (29) in his excellent *The Sabbath and the Sanctuary* (WUNT 2:349; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), our respective conclusions on the implications of this exegetical move differ substantially, as do – or more likely, because of – the range of post-biblical texts that we examine. Restricting his study to the Book of Hebrews and the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, Calaway finds only theological implications for the “layer[ing] of sacred space and time onto one another” (29). The function of this interpretive move in both of these texts is, for Calaway, to authorize or envision *spiritual* or *liturgical* access to the sacred. Thus after describing how Hebrews (3:7–4:11) temporalizes God’s “rest” (Ps 95:11) and takes it as referring not to the promised land (Ps 95:7–11), but to the Sabbath, Calaway envelops this move with the wider motifs in Hebrews of Jesus’ high-priesthood, self-sacrifice, and heavenly Temple. On the basis of these latter motifs, Calaway then re-reads the role of the Sabbath in Hebrews as a metonym for the enduring spiritual access to sacred realities that was assured to all of Jesus’ adherents by virtue of his death (176). Calaway juxtaposes these texts with the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, which portray the weekly Sabbath as a liturgical means through which one could gain entry to the heavenly Temple when religio-political realities prevented their entry to the earthly Temple. (For an overall evaluation of the book on its own merits, see N. Moore, review of Jared Calaway, *The Sabbath and the Sanctaury*, *JTS* 65 [2014]: 236–39.) My findings diverge from Calaway’s in numerous respects. First, they negate Calaway’s assertion that “The *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and Hebrews are the only works after the Pentateuch to bring the Sabbath and tabernacle back together” (97). As I argue below, this motif is on display in an extensive array of ancient Jewish texts, both explicitly and implicitly. Second, I demonstrate the pervasive importance of “Eden” for heightening the Sabbath-Temple connection. Finally, I illustrate how the exegetical interplay between Sabbath and Temple is perhaps best seen with the spawning of a series of *ritual* concerns – most distinctly as the practice of maintaining the Sabbath in a state of ritual purity.

II. Sabbath and Sanctification; Sabbath and Temple

The association of the Sabbath with sanctity is attested in some thirteen verses in the Hebrew Bible.³ In general, these mentions may be classified in three different ways:

- (a) God Himself sanctified (*קדש*) the (primordial) Sabbath (Gen 2:3; Exod 20:11)
- (b) The Israelites themselves must sanctify the Sabbath (Exod 20:8; Deut 5:12; LXX Deut 5:15;⁴ Ezek 20:20; 44:24; Jer 17:22, 27; Neh 13:22)
- (c) The Sabbath itself is sacred and must not be profaned (*חלל*) (Exod 31:14–15; 35:2; ~Lev 23:3).

The repeated imperative to *sanctify* the Sabbath and the day's susceptibility to *profanation*, seemingly invite the Sabbath into the realm of cultic law. Indeed, associations between Sabbath and cult are borne out elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. Thus the Sabbath code in Exodus 31 (vv. 12–17), which is itself redolent of cultic language, appears on the heels of more than seven chapters of priestly regulations governing the construction and operation of the Tabernacle.⁵ In similar fashion, six additional chapters of instruction concerning the Tabernacle (Exod 35–40) are prefaced by a command to observe the Sabbath (35:2).⁶ Finally, in Leviticus (19:30, 26:2) we find the suggestive injunction issued by God to “keep My Sabbaths and reverence My sanctuary.”

Mention of the Sabbath is – with few exceptions – conspicuously absent from the deuteronomistic history.⁷ In the prophetic literature, however, the

3 Gen 2:3; Exod 20:8, 11; 31:13–15; 35:2; Lev 23:3; Deut 5:12; Ezek 20:20; Jer 17:22, 27; Neh 13:22. And see N.-E. A. Andreassen, *The Old Testament Sabbath: A Tradition-Historical Investigation* (SBLDS 7; Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972), 204–6. For a reception history and textual-critical view of God's “blessing” of the Sabbath (Gen 2:3), see David Frankel, “Did God Bless Shabbat?” *TheTorah.Com*, <https://thetorah.com/did-god-bless-shabbat/>.

4 See W. Horbury, *Herodian Judaism and New Testament Study* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 131.

5 On these passages, see D. C. Timmer, *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath: The Sabbath Frame of Exodus 31:12–17; 35:1–3 in Exegetical and Theological Perspective* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 43–57. See also Calaway, *The Sabbath*, 38–45.

6 Also noting this juxtaposition and its connection to the priestly school is Y. Amit, “Creation and the Calendar of Holiness,” in *Tehillah Le-Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg* (eds. M. Cogan, B. L. Eichler, and J. H. Tigay; Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 13*–29*, 23* (Hebrew). See also S. B. Hoenig, “The Designated Number of Kinds of Labor Prohibited on the Sabbath,” *JQR* 68 (1978): 193–208, 203–4, albeit with regard to the association between Sabbath and Tabernacle in rabbinic literature (see below). On the relationship between Exod 35 and Exod 25–31, see P. J. Kearney, “Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Ex 25–40,” *ZAW* 89:3 (1977): 375–86, 378–79.

7 For the exceptions, see Deut 5:12–15; 2 Kgs 4:22–23; 11:4–12; 16:17–18. On these texts, see G. Robinson, *The Origin and Development of the Old Testament Sabbath: A Comprehensive Exegetical Approach* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1988), 51–52; 74–89.

Sabbath is elevated to a place of great prominence, and, as in the texts mentioned above, connections with the cult persist.⁸ Ezekiel (22:8), for example, juxtaposes Sabbath and cult when reprimanding the Israelites for having “despised my holy things and profaned my sabbaths.”⁹ Later (Ezek 46:1–8), Ezekiel devotes specific attention to the sacrifices to be offered on the Sabbath (and new moons).¹⁰ A number of other texts voice particular opprobrium for those who would profane the Sabbath within the walls of Jerusalem.¹¹ One of these passages, which is found in the midst of a lengthy diatribe against the profanation of the Sabbath, even provides a suggestive association between the sanctification of the Sabbath, the Temple, and ritual purity (Neh 13:22a):

ואמרה ללויים אשר יהיו מטהרים ובאים שמרים השערים לקדש את-יום השבת

And I commanded the Levites that they should purify themselves and come and guard the gates, to keep the sabbath day holy.¹²

Thus, the sanctification of the Sabbath is repeatedly interlinked with the Tabernacle/Temple, both explicitly and by suggestive juxtaposition.

III. Sabbath, Cult, and Creation

Moreover, the cultic underpinnings of the Sabbath go back even further: to the creation narratives in Genesis.¹³ Thus God’s observance and sanctification of the seventh day (Gen 2:1–3) has been regarded by some scholars as constituting the functional climax of the priestly creation narrative.¹⁴ Taken to-

8 Moshe Weinfeld suggests that the Sabbath was a time when the Israelites would come to the Temple to perform their obeisance; this would explain the emphasis on the priestly role. See *idem*, “God the Creator in Gen. 1 and in the Prophecy of Second Isaiah,” *Tarbiz* 37 (1968): 105–32, 109 (Hebrew). See also Y. D. Gilat, *Studies in the Development of the Halakhah* (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1992), 303 (Hebrew).

9 This verse has been seen as representing the transformation of the Sabbath into “the functional equivalent of the Temple.” See A. Cooper and B. Goldstein, “The Development of Priestly Calendars (I): The Daily Sacrifice and the Sabbath,” *HUCA* 74 (2003): 1–20, 19. See also Calaway, *The Sabbath*, 46–51.

10 The relationship between Sabbath and new moon is beyond the scope of the current work. See H. A. McKay, *Sabbath and Synagogue: The Question of Sabbath Worship in Ancient Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 11–42.

11 See, e.g., Neh 13:15–22; Jer 17:21.

12 All biblical translations are from NRSV, unless otherwise noted.

13 Kearney (“Creation and Liturgy,” 375) has noted that the Tabernacle unit of Exodus 25–31 is divided into seven speeches, with the seventh speech containing the “command to observe the Sabbath” (375). He further argues that “each of the seven speeches alludes to the corresponding day of creation in Gen. 1:2–3” (*ibid.*). Of course, Exodus 31:17b makes explicit reference to six days of creation and God’s resting on the seventh day. See also J. Blenkinsopp, “The Structure of P,” *CBQ* 38 (1976): 275–92, 280–82. Cf. J. Levenson, *Creation and the Persistence of Evil* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988), 82–84.

14 See, e.g., C. Westermann, *Genesis: A Commentary*, Vol. 1 (trans. J. J. Scullion; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984), 171–72; Levenson, *Creation*, 100. Edwin Firmage provides an excellent survey of scholarship on the “purpose” of the priestly creation narrative, although he ar-

gether with the systematic program of the priestly writer, this etiology for the Sabbath invites associations with the cultic world of the priesthood.¹⁵ Indeed, the rest-as-cult motif is apparent elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible (Exod 20:11 and Ps 132:8, 14) as well as in ancient Near Eastern creation myths.¹⁶

Cultic resonances continue to reverberate in the subsequent Eden narrative (also known as the second creation account), this despite its presumed non-priestly authorship.¹⁷ Of particular note is the seeming reciprocal connection between the Garden of Eden and the Temple.¹⁸ The Temple is described, particularly in Ezekiel, as an Edenic, paradisiacal garden;¹⁹ while in Genesis, the Garden of Eden is loaded with symbolic language that, as Gordon Wenham has noted, evokes

An archetypal sanctuary, that is, a place where God dwells and where man should worship him. Many of the features of the garden may also be found in later sanctuaries, particularly the tabernacle or Jerusalem temple. These parallels suggest that the garden itself is understood as a sort of sanctuary.²⁰

gues that Genesis 1 should be viewed with an eye toward the priestly dietary laws. See *idem*, "Genesis 1 and the Priestly Agenda," *JSOT* 82 (1999): 97–114. For the priestly significance of the number seven, see Robinson, *Origin and Development*, 297. I should note that the verb שבת is thematic here, but the day is not referred to as *the* Sabbath.

- 15 See Weinfeld, "God the Creator," 109–10. As Weinfeld notes, "there is no priestly narrative without a clear agenda" (p. 110; my translation). The question of whether the first creation narrative was authored by P or H is beyond the scope of this current paper.
- 16 See, e.g., M. Weinfeld, "Sabbath, Temple, and the Enthronement of the Lord: The Problem of the Sitz im Leben of Genesis 1:1–2:3," in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles* (eds. A. Caquot and M. Delcor; AOAT 212; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1981), 501–12, esp. 501–2. On the disconnect between the Israelite Sabbath and Ancient Near Eastern calendars, see W. Hallo, "New Moons and Sabbaths: A Case-Study in the Contrastive Approach," *HUCA* 48 (1977): 1–18.
- 17 For a critical summary of scholarship on the authorship of the second creation narrative, see J.-L. Ska, "Genesis 2–3: Some Fundamental Questions," in *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2–3) and Its Reception History* (eds. K. Schmid and C. Riedweg; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 1–27.
- 18 For bibliography and an extensive study, see L. Mazar, "The Correlation Between the Garden of Eden and the Temple," *Shnaton: An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 13 (2002): 5–42 (Hebrew). While not disputing the basic intertextual relationship between Eden and Temple, Ronald Hendel underscores the mythic tension in the Eden narrative. The latter represents a state in which the "world of human finitude is our only world and paradise is sealed off from us." See *idem*, "Other Edens," in *Exploring the Longue Durée: Essays in Honor of Lawrence E. Stager* (ed. J. D. Schloen; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 185–89.
- 19 For a critical evaluation of these passages, see T. Stordalen, "Heaven on Earth – Or Not? Jerusalem as Eden in Biblical Literature," in *Beyond Eden*, 28–57. Even beyond the Israelite/Jewish canon, the "equation of Temple mount and paradise" has "roots in the mythopoetic mind of the ancient Near East." See J. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987), 131. See also the extensive exploration of this theme in T. Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden: Genesis 2–3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature* (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2000), ch. 10; F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), 156.
- 20 See G. Wenham, "Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story," in *I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood* (eds. R. S. Hess and D. T. Tsumura; Winona Lake, Indiana:

In sum, the above evidence demonstrates the substantive associations made in the Hebrew Bible between (a) Sabbath and sanctity/sanctification and (b) Sabbath and priestly cult, as well as between (c) the Garden of Eden and the Temple/Tabernacle. As I will illustrate below, these connections were both detected and put to use in sectarian compositions with strong priestly concerns. It is a result of this web of connections, I will argue, that purity law became intertwined with Sabbath observance in certain ancient Jewish communities.²¹

IV. Jubilees

The matrix of Sabbath-Temple-Eden is both recognized and amplified in the book of *Jubilees*. Indeed, if the Sabbath is the *implicit* pinnacle of the priestly creation narrative in the Hebrew Bible, it is the *explicit* pinnacle of the creation narrative in *Jubilees*. Thus after relating the events of the sixth day of creation (2:13–16), the book devotes the remainder of the chapter (vv. 17–33) to the significance of, and the legal regulations governing, the Sabbath.

After its lengthy excursus on the Sabbath, *Jubilees* returns to paraphrase and expand upon the “second” creation narrative (3:1–7).²² Tellingly, *Jubilees* adds a cultic framework to this chapter. Thus Eve is said to have both set the precedent for, and been bound by, the laws of parturient (im)purity (*Jub.* 3:9–11; cf. Lev 12:2–5). After her creation, consequently, she was kept out of the Garden of Eden for eighty days until her period of waiting was complete, “because [Eden] is more holy than any land” (3:12).²³ This law is then extrapolated to the wider cultic arena (3:13):

Eisenbrauns, 1994), 399–404, 399. Wenham cites (a) the cherubs stationed by God to guard the entrance to the Garden’s east (Gen 3:24); (b) the use of the verb הִתְהַלֵּךְ to describe God walking in Eden just as it describes God walking in the Tabernacle and in the Israelite camp centered around the Tabernacle; and the (c) tunics (sing., *ketonet*) with which Adam and Eve, and Aaron and his sons, are said to have been dressed – with the *hiphil* of the verb *lavash* (Gen 3:21, Lev 8:13). Cf. Timmer, *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath*, 80–81.

21 Doering, however, argues that the exegetical model for Sabbath purification is from the “sanctification” of the Israelites prior to revelation at Sinai (Exodus 19:10). See L. Doering, “Purity Regulations Concerning the Sabbath in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery* (eds. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 600–9, 605. Doering’s comprehensive analysis of Sabbath purity law is groundbreaking, and my work and thinking on this topic owe much to his research.

22 On *Jubilees*’ narration of the second creation narrative, see J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, “Eden and the Temple: The Rewriting of Genesis 2:4–3:24 in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. G. P. Lutikhuisen; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 63–94.

23 It appears that the Qumranites adopted this practice into their ritual-legal canon; see below.

Therefore the ordinances of these days were ordained for anyone who bears a male or female that she might not touch anything holy and she might not enter the sanctuary until these days are completed for a male or a female.

Jubilees likewise insinuates that after their first sexual encounter, which takes place before their entrance into Eden, Adam and Eve maintained a state of celibacy during their time in the Garden.²⁴ This abstention from sex in the Garden, which stands in stark contrast with later rabbinic traditions, is befitting both of *Jubilees*' view of Eden as Temple, as well as the sectarian prohibition (CD XII:1–2) against sex in the Temple city. It is therefore quite suggestive that *Jubilees* later (50:8) prohibits sexual intercourse on the Sabbath.²⁵

Elsewhere, *Jubilees* refers to the Garden of Eden as the “Holy of Holies and the residence of the Lord,” adding later that it was “created as a holy place” (8:19).²⁶ Finally, Adam is said to have made an incense offering immediately after being clothed by God (3:27). Scholars have rightly noted that given the overt references to Eden functioning as a Temple, this verse may very well describe Adam's investiture into the priesthood.²⁷

It is against this backdrop that we should assess *Jubilees*' approach toward the sanctification of the Sabbath. As in the biblical sources highlighted above, the temporal otherness, sanctity, and importance of the Sabbath feature repeatedly in *Jubilees*.²⁸ For *Jubilees*, the Sabbath is both “blessed” and “sacred” (2:24; evoking Gen 2:3), leading to the following warning (2:25):

- 24 See G. Anderson, “Celibacy or Consummation in the Garden? Reflections on Early Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Garden of Eden,” *HTR* 82:2 (April 1989): 121–48.
- 25 There are plausible grounds for suspecting whether chapter 50 of *Jubilees*, especially the extended Sabbath code in vv. 6–13, is to be regarded as an organic part of the “original work.” See L. Ravid, “The Relationship of the Sabbath Laws in *Jubilees* 50:6–13 to the Rest of the Book,” *Tarbiz* 69:2 (2000): 161–66 (Hebrew); Cf. Doering, “The Concept of the Sabbath in the Book of *Jubilees*,” 187–89. See also J. C. VanderKam, “The End of the Matter? *Jubilees* 50:6–13 and the Unity of the Book,” in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism* (eds. L. LiDonnici and A. Lieber; JSJSup 119; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 267–84; *idem*, “Recent Scholarship on the Book of *Jubilees*,” *Currents in Biblical Research* 6 (2008): 405–31, 410–16; L. Doering, “Jub 50:6–13 als Schlussabschnitt des ‘Jubiläenbuchs’ – Nachtrag aus Qumran oder ursprünglicher Bestandteil des Werks?” *RevQ* 20 (2002): 359–87.
- 26 See also *Jub.* 4:23–26. And see J. Milgrom, “The Concept of Impurity in *Jubilees* and the Temple Scroll,” *RevQ* 16 (1993): 277–84; esp. 277–78.
- 27 See S. N. Lambden, “From Fig Leaves to Fingernails: Some Notes on the Garments of Adam and Eve in the Hebrew Bible and Select Early Postbiblical Jewish Writings,” in *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical, and Literary Images of Eden* (eds. P. Morris and D. F. Sawyer; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 74–90. According to Lambden, “Early sources suggest that the concept of the priesthood of Adam played a greater role in early postbiblical Judaism than extant literatures indicate” (p. 79). See also B. Ego, “Heilige Zeit – heiliger Raum – heiliger Mensch: Beobachtungen zur Struktur der Gesetzesbegründung in der Schöpfungs- und Paradiesgeschichte des Jubiläenbuchs,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (eds. M. Albani et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 207–20. Ego regards Adam, in this context, as the *Urtype* of the High Priest.
- 28 For a general overview of the Sabbath passages in *Jubilees*, see L. Doering, “The Concept of the Sabbath in the Book of *Jubilees*,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (eds. M. Albani et

Anyone who would do any work on it was to die; also, the one who would *defile* (Ethiopic: *rak^{wsa}*) it was to die.²⁹

As Doering has noted, this passage is a clear paraphrase of the latter part of Exod 31:14:

ושמרתם את־השבת כי קדש הוא לכם מחלליה מות יומת כי כל־העשה בה מלאכה ונכרתה הנפש ההוא מקרב עמיה

You shall keep the Sabbath, because it is holy for you; everyone who profanes it shall be put to death; whoever does any work on it shall be cut off from among the people.

While the passage from *Jubilees* attests a number of interesting divergences from the biblical verse,³⁰ perhaps the most significant is a verb change: the “*profaning*” (מחלל) of the Sabbath from Exod 31:14 is supplanted with “*defiling*” (the Ethiopic *rak^{wsa}* pointing to a Hebrew *Vorlage* of מטמא) the Sabbath.³¹ In addition, we should take note of the handling of the two parts of the biblical verse: Exodus 31:14b employs the causal כי as a means of glossing חלל in v. 14a. In other words, the two halves of the verse in MT speak of one and the same offense: one profanes the Sabbath by performing forbidden labor. *Jubilees*, however, replaces the causal particle with a conjunction, thereby keeping the two clauses independent of one another.³² Consequently, for *Jubilees*, defiling the Sabbath would seem to constitute a *separate* offense from doing work on the Sabbath.³³ These two divergences from MT are maintained in the follow-

al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 179–205, esp. 185–200. The Sabbath is portrayed not only as the first commandment of God to the Israelites, but as the backdrop for the etiology of the election of the People of Israel (2:16–2:22). On this motif, see M. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 238–40. Similarly, *Jubilees* relates the sanctification of the Israelites to God’s sanctifying the Sabbath (2:19). Moreover, God Himself – together with the angels – is portrayed in *Jubilees* as observing the Sabbath (2:18), which is said to be more sacred than any other day (2:26).

29 Translation from J. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Lovanii: E. Peeters, 1989). On the semantic range of *rak^{wsa}*, see W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1987), 470.

30 First, the passage from *Jubilees* inverts the order of Exod. 31:14, in which the “defiler” comes before “anyone who would do work.” Second, *Jubilees* seemingly harmonizes the two distinct punishments attested in the verse.

31 See Doering, “Concept of the Sabbath, 195–96. Milgrom (“Concept of Impurity,” 280) notes that the “interchange between *hol* and *tame*” is apparent already in Ezekiel (e.g., with regard to the desecration of God’s name). On the uses of *rak^{wsa}* in *Jubilees*, see W. Loader, *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees on Sexuality* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 216–35. Whereas *Jubilees* employs *r-k^w-s* in verses 25 and 26, the more rare verb *g-m-n*, which has a similar semantic range (see Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary*, 194), is used in v. 27. That *Jubilees* employs two distinct verbs here lends further justification to seeing two distinct Hebrew verbs (*tm’* and *hll*) behind the Ethiopic. I would like to thank Aaron Butts for his assistance with these linguistic issues.

32 See Doering, “Concept of the Sabbath,” 195. It appears that LXX makes a similar move.

33 Indeed, according to Doering (“The Concept of the Sabbath,” 196), “When the sanctification of the sabbath consists, among others, of avoiding pollution, the sabbath regulations become open for purity rules.”

ing passage as well (v. 26),³⁴ which affirms the distinction between “defiling” the Sabbath and “doing work” thereon.³⁵ Thus it appears that Jubilees is taking a metonymical reading of the repeated biblical reminders that the Sabbath is *holy* and is not to be *profaned*. The above injunctions imply that the Sabbath is *pure* and is not to be *defiled*.³⁶

Yet contrary to the high level of detail provided in *Jubilees* concerning the exact nature of those activities that are prohibited on the Sabbath (see 2:29–30; 50:8–12), this metonymical reading lacks a prescriptive legal framework.³⁷ Aside from a warning against profaning the Sabbath, which is suggestively juxtaposed with a prohibition against having sex with one’s wife (50:8), *Jubilees* provides no details regarding the respective mechanisms by which one might sanctify, purify, defile, or profane the Sabbath.³⁸ And while sanctification and profanation are a binary pair,³⁹ *Jubilees* provides no positive complement to remedy the “defiling” of the Sabbath, such as an imperative to (somehow) “purify” the day.⁴⁰ It is not altogether unsurprising that in his remarks on these

34 These passages are attested in fragmentary form in the Qumran scrolls, but key pieces of the text are missing, including where the Hebrew translation of *rak*^w*sa* should appear. See J. VanderKam and J. T. Milik, “4QJubilees: 4Q218 Frg. 1,” in H. Attridge et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 35–38.

35 On the distinction between textual and exegetical variants and their uses for the sectarian communities of the Second Temple period, see T. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 12–28; and more recently, see Lim’s “Biblical Quotations in the Pesharim,” in *idem*, *Pesharim* (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 54–63.

36 A more conservative reading of the Ethiopic which sees behind *rak*^w*sa* BH חָלַל – rather than נָטַם, per Doering whom I follow here, and despite the use of *g-m-n* in v. 27 – may still be reconciled with my overarching argument. In addition to the interchange between the BH terms noted by Milgrom (see above, note 31), it may also be the case that it is the impurity generated by illicit activities that profanes the Sabbath. On this class of prohibitions, see below, note 56. The text in *Jubilees*, consequently, would then be speaking of the end result (profaning), rather than the mechanism (defiling).

37 Doering, “The Concept of the Sabbath,” 196. See also Milgrom, “The Concept of Impurity,” esp. 281.

38 In certain respects, this silence is reflective of *Jubilees*’ concerns – or lack thereof – for purity at large. L. Ravid (“Purity and Impurity in the Book of Jubilees,” *JSP* 13 [2002]: 61–86) has noted that aside from the provision regarding Eve’s entry to Eden (see above), “there are no laws on impurity, neither are there laws governing purification” in *Jubilees* (*ibid.*, p. 76). James VanderKam critiques the polemical agenda posited by Ravid for these omissions; see *idem*, “Viewed from Another Angle: Purity and Impurity in the Book of Jubilees,” *JSP* 13 (2002): 209–15.

39 A detailed examination of the relationship between these two terms may be found in Milgrom, “The Concept of Impurity,” 279–80.

40 This is not to say that *Jubilees* does not attest any positive commandments for the Sabbath. To the contrary, the Israelites are enjoined to eat and drink (2:31; 50:10) as well as to bless God (50:9) on the Sabbath. That said, nowhere does *Jubilees* indicate that these actions function either as sanctifying/purifying the Sabbath or as ritual countermeasures against its profanation/defiling. Cf. the rabbinic midrashim on the Festivals, below.

verses, Chanoch Albeck conceded that “defiling” here was to be understood “in its broadest sense, as opposed to the ‘holiness’ of the Sabbath.”⁴¹

V. 2 Maccabees

Scholars have long seen in a stray verse in *2 Maccabees* (12:38) a practice consonant with the binary opposite of defiling the Sabbath:⁴²

Judas assembled the army and proceeded to the city of Adullam. Due to the onset of the seventh day they purified themselves according to the custom⁴³ and celebrated the Sabbath there.⁴⁴

If *Jubilees* provides the very suggestive notion of defiling the Sabbath, but nothing further, this text seemingly confirms the existence of a larger and more coherent framework of Sabbath (im)purity. It does so by providing the “customary” system for remedying one’s defiled status: ritual immersion.⁴⁵

Louis Ginzberg spoke unequivocally regarding this verse in *2 Maccabees*, asserting that the verse does indeed constitute evidence of “the custom to purify oneself for the Sabbath.”⁴⁶ Gedalyahu Alon followed a similar tack, noting that the purification in *2 Maccabees* was “on account of the sanctity of the Sabbath,” and he attempted to situate the custom as an antecedent of related

41 C. Albeck, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha* (Berlin: Siegfried Scholem, 1930), 9–10 (quote from p. 10; my translation).

42 For an overview of scholarship, see Doering, “Purity Regulations,” 602.

43 Goldstein renders, “according to the established custom.” See J. A. Goldstein, *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1983), 431. ἔθισμός may have an even stronger connotation, as it is employed to render כְּמִשְׁפָּט in 1 Kgs 18:28. Doering (“Purity Regulations,” 602) doubts that the custom mentioned in this verse was widespread, given its lack of mention in rabbinic literature. As I demonstrate below, however, there are certainly abundant *resonances* of this custom in rabbinic literature.

44 English translation from D. R. Schwartz, *2 Maccabees* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 416.

45 The demand for ritual immersion signifies that we are dealing with a form of *ritual*, rather than *moral* impurity. On the distinction between the two, see J. Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 26–27; see also the seminal work of A. Büchler, *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century* (London: Oxford University Press, 1928). Neither author enters any substantive discussion of moral (im)purity and the Sabbath. Cf. below, n. 61. On the other hand, that *Jubilees* lacks mention of immersion is theoretically consonant with the book’s decided concern for moral, rather than ritual purity. See Klawans, 46–48. Cf. L. Doering, “Purity and Impurity in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* (eds. G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 261–75.

46 See L. Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1976), 63. Ginzberg is also of the opinion that the prohibition in CD XI:14 against spending the Sabbath in the presence of Gentiles is rooted in “a requirement that the Sabbath be spent in ritual purity.” Cf. L. H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 123–24.

customs in rabbinic literature.⁴⁷ Lutz Doering perhaps best summarizes the integration of *2 Maccabees* with *Jubilees*: “Pollution of the sabbath is avoided, among others, by the sabbath keepers’ abstention from ritual defilement.”⁴⁸

Particularly given the perceived lack of evidence for such a ritual framework in subsequent rabbinic law, some commentators to *2 Maccabees* struggle to concede the possibility that the text refers to ritual immersion for the Sabbath. Ralph Marcus, for example, contends that this immersion had nothing to do with the Sabbath: “purification was necessary after the shedding of blood,” a practice that is reflected in the aftermath of the Israelite campaign against Midian (Num 31:19–24).⁴⁹ Daniel R. Schwartz momentarily ponders the possibility that this purification “pertains to purifying rituals for before the Sabbath,”⁵⁰ but refers the reader to Jonathan Goldstein’s numerous postulates instead. According to Goldstein,

Judas and his men did not merely bathe; they ritually purified themselves ... The purification here seems to be connected with the Sabbath ... In rabbinic sources there is no law requiring ritual purity on the Sabbath (by full immersion in a ritual bath) ... Nevertheless, Hasidic Jews today observe the “custom” of ritual immersion before the Sabbath.⁵¹

Thus, Goldstein takes seriously the association of this ritual purification with the Sabbath, but he struggles to corroborate the existence of this custom in the classical Jewish canon. I argue below that there are, indeed, strong resonances of this practice in rabbinic literature – particularly in the Mishnah. To better situate and contextualize these rabbinic texts, I turn to some of the better developed examples of Sabbath purity law in Second Temple literature.

VI. Qumran

Confirmation of the practice of ritual purification before the Sabbath might be found in a fragment from Qumran (4Q512), which, after mentioning the Sabbath, Festivals, and other holy days, preserves the fragmentary [במים] בְּמִים, “in water [...] to consecrate oneself.”⁵² By the same token, other prac-

47 G. Alon, “The Bounds of the Laws of Levitical Cleanliness,” in *Jews, Judaism and the Classical World* (trans. I. Abrahams; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977), 204–5.

48 Doering, “The Concept of the Sabbath,” 196.

49 R. Marcus, *Law in the Apocrypha* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1927), 80.

50 Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 438–39.

51 Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 447–48. On the kabbalistic custom of pre-Sabbath immersion, which is first recorded in the sixteenth century *Tola’at Yaaqov*, see E. K. Ginsburg, *The Sabbath in the Classical Kabbalah* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1989), 227–31; and see Ginsburg’s citation of *2 Maccabees* on p. 249 n. 37.

52 4Q512 33+35 iv 5; see M. Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4:III* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 264. See Doering, “Purity Regulations,” 600–1. On purification before festivals in rabbinic literature, see below, pp. 67–68.

tices attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls appear to be aimed at preserving one's ritual purity status through the Sabbath day.⁵³ Some scholars have argued that the *Damascus Document* also contains countermeasures, which, while not stated so explicitly, guard against Sabbath impurity. These include the prohibition against wearing "garments soiled with feces" (בגדים צואיים) on the Sabbath (CD XI:3–4),⁵⁴ which may be motivated by the notion attested elsewhere in sectarian texts that feces "were considered ... a source of ritual impurity."⁵⁵ Immediately following this injunction is a prohibition against "voluntary intermingling" (אל יתערב איש מרצונו) on the Sabbath (CD XI:4). While the precise rendering of this phrase is contested, Qimron and Schiffman have provided ample arguments in support of it referring to violations of ritual purity.⁵⁶

Given the fragmentary state of the evidence from Qumran, it is difficult to determine precisely *why* the sect was concerned with maintaining a state of ritual purity over the Sabbath. I would argue, however, that the ritualization of the Sabbath-Temple-Eden paradigm is lurking behind these provisions. In one instance, the triad even serves to explain the coherence of an otherwise eclectic collection of laws. The collective fragments of 4QMiscellaneous Rules (4Q265) are distinguished "due to the remarkably diverse character of [their] contents and the multiple literary genres" represented therein.⁵⁷ This diversity is particularly evident in Fragment 7, which opens with (highly fragmentary)

53 See the sources collected in Doering, "Purity Regulations."

54 Compare the Essene practice, preserved by Josephus (*War* 2.147–8), to refrain from using the toilet on the Sabbath. See M. Broshi, "Qumran and the Essenes: Six Realms of Purity," *Megillot* 2 (2004): 9–20 (Hebrew).

55 Doering, "Purity Regulations," 603, citing 11QT^a XLVI:13–6; 1QM VII:6–7.

56 For a summary of scholarship, see Doering, "Purity Regulations," 603–4; 606–7. See also the more comprehensive discussions in E. Qimron, "The Halakhah of the Damascus Document: An Interpretation of 'Al Yit'arev,'" in *Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies*, D:1 (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1986), 9–15 (Hebrew); Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran*, 106–9. It is interesting to note, in this context, the *Damascus Document's* prohibition against "vile and empty" speech on the Sabbath (CD 10:17–19). One could postulate that CD prohibits such idle chatter as a consequence of its ability to profane, and thereby defile, the Sabbath – similar to the above noted provisions in the CD Sabbath code. According to Alex Jassen (*Scripture and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014], 79), however, this injunction does not constitute a separate prohibition, but rather a "general classificatory statement" which limits the scope of speech acts prohibited by Isaiah 58:13 to matters of business and commerce. This is to be contrasted with the law found in 4Q264a (I i 7–8), which "extends this restriction to all nonsacred and nonessential conversation" (*ibid.*, 99). The same fragment also preserves a positive formulation of the law, which allows "words of holy matters," blessings, and speech concerning food and drink. On these passages see V. Noam and E. Qimron, "A Qumran Composition of Sabbath Laws and Its Contribution to the Study of Early Halakah," *DSD* 16 (2009): 55–96, 60–61; Jassen, *Scripture and Law*, ch. 5, esp. 97–100. Indeed, Noam and Qimron regard this law as reflective of the "conception [that] the Sabbath is 'a Sabbath of the Lord your God' (Exod 20:10), 'hallowed' by the Lord (v. 11), and not for mundane matters" (60). Nevertheless, the precise mechanism behind these speech restrictions remains unclear.

57 J. M. Baumgarten, "4QMiscellaneous Rules," in *Qumran Cave 4* (DJD 35; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 57–78, 58.

laws pertaining to the Sabbath (ll. 1–2); continues with priestly Sabbath law (ll. 3–6), including what appears to be a restriction against “the sprinkling of the purification water” on the Sabbath;⁵⁸ and closes with Adam and Eve in Eden (ll. 11–14) and the laws of parturient impurity governing their entry into the Garden (ll. 15–17).⁵⁹ Baumgarten rightly sees coherence in the latter two topics, as they serve to confirm what is strongly insinuated in *Jub.* 3:8–13, i. e., that the laws of ritual purity applicable to the Temple were to be enforced in Eden.⁶⁰ Yet the connection between this fragment of 4Q265 and *Jubilees* is even deeper, as the former’s purity provisions, which speak of the Temple-like sanctity of Eden, come on the heels of laws relating to the Sabbath – a telling juxtaposition which, as explored above, is evident in *Jubilees* as well.

The Sabbath-Temple diad lurks elsewhere in sectarian writings. In addition to its purity-related Sabbath laws (see above), the *Damascus Document*’s Sabbath code (CD X:14–XI:18) is placed suggestively between two sections (CD X:10–13; XI:19–12:2) dealing with purity and purity-related sacrificial law.⁶¹ Finally, the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* suggestively refer to God as the “king of purity.”⁶²

VII. Interim Synthesis

The *sanctity* of the Sabbath was understood by a number of Jewish writers of the Second Temple period as the *purity* of the day; and the *profaning* of the Sabbath was understood as the *defiling* of the day. Consequently, following Doer-

58 See Baumgarten, “4Q Miscellaneous Rules,” 71, who likewise cites similar restrictions in 4Q274 2 I; 4Q251 1 6.

59 The intervening appearance of what Baumgarten terms the “eschatological Communal Council” (ll. 7–10) remains difficult.

60 See J. M. Baumgarten, “Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and *Jubilees*,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies* (ed. G. J. Brooke; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 3–10; see also *idem*, “Scripture and Law in 4Q265,” in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 25–33. Adding to the Temple-Eden connection is Michael Wise’s rendering of the ambiguous phrase מִקְדָּשׁ אָדָם in 4Q Florilegium as “the Temple of Adam.” See M. Wise, “4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam,” *RevQ* 15 (1991): 103–32.

61 On this juxtaposition, see the sources cited in Jassen, *Scripture and Law*, 225 n. 38. Didache 14:1–3, which expresses a concern for the (moral) purity of one’s “sacrifice” on the Lord’s Day, offers an interesting comparison with CD XI:18–21, which immediately after discussing Sabbath sacrifice is similarly concerned for the purity of one’s sacrificial emissary. A concern for moral purity on the Sabbath also appears to be evident in Philo (*On the Decalogue* § 98), who views the day as a time to “consider whether any offence against purity (καθαρῶς) had been committed in the preceding days.”

62 4Q403 1 ii, 26. On the God-as-king motif in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, see A. M. Schwemer, “Gott als König und seine Königsherrschaft in den Sabbatliedern aus Qumran,” in *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult* (eds. M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), 45–118. See also Calaway, *The Sabbath*, 92–95.

ing, I have highlighted resonances of the practice of ritual immersion prior to the Sabbath, which constitutes the ritual countermeasure against “defiling” the sacred day. This metonymical reading, I argue, is impelled by two overarching exegetical moves: (a) a strong reading of the repeated biblical mentions of sanctification in conjunction with the Sabbath; and (b) the Sabbath-Temple-Eden matrix, which draws Sabbath law into the realm of cultic law.

More significantly, these writings showcase an alternative view of the nature of the Sabbath’s sacred time. Just as access to the sacred space of the Temple precinct is contingent upon the ritual purity of the entrant,⁶³ the same may be said for the Sabbath day, the ritually correct commencement of which requires the purification of s/he who observes the day. As Baruch Bokser has written, albeit with regard to Essene Sabbath strictures:

[They] took the Sabbath as a Temple; by observing the rules required for sacred space during this sacred period, they tried to create and experience the sacred dimension.⁶⁴

We may thus speak of two intersecting systems of purification: a *spatial* requirement for the Temple, and a *temporal* requirement for the Sabbath.⁶⁵

While Jacob Milgrom argues that time, as with all non-concrete entities, cannot be defiled, the Qumran sectarians thought otherwise.⁶⁶ The *Temple Scroll* in particular makes clear that the sect regarded the entire city of Jerusalem – and not just the Temple precinct – as a sacred space to be protected from impurity.⁶⁷ Indeed, according to the *Temple Scroll* (XIV:11–14), impurity defiles the city itself.⁶⁸ While both the Temple and its surrounding city are

63 M. Kel. 1:6–9. For a brief summary of the rabbinic system, see H. K. Harrington, *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis: Biblical Foundations* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 35–42. See also C. Werman, “The Concept of Holiness and the Requirements of Purity in Second Temple and Tannaic Literature,” in *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. S. D. Fraade, A. Shemesh, and R. Clements; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 163–79.

64 B. Bokser, “Approaching Sacred Space,” *HTR* 78 (1985): 279–99, 285.

65 Also noted by Doering, “The Concept of the Sabbath,” 196; “Purity and Impurity in Jubilees,” 264, 269. Doering, however, contends that *Jubilees* derived this construct “by analogy from Exodus 19:10, 15,” where the Israelites were ordered to launder their clothing and abstain from intercourse prior to revelation at Sinai. Ravid (“Purity and Impurity,” 71) speaks of this as a “metaphysical impurity ... which lacks any physical dimension.” There may likewise be resonances of the spatial extension of Sabbath holiness in the Sabbath-centric language employed in the legislation of the seventh-year “Sabbath of the Land.” See J. Stackert, “The Sabbath of the Land in the Holiness Legislation: Combining Priestly and Non-Priestly Perspectives,” *CBQ* 73 (2011): 239–50, esp. 246; see also Calaway, *The Sabbath*, 84–89.

66 Milgrom, “The Concept of Impurity,” 279. Milgrom goes so far as to say that, in this regard, the authors of both *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll* had a confused conception of the purity system.

67 Milgrom (*ibid.*) likewise regarded this case as a mistaken understanding of the purity system.

68 There is some disagreement among scholars as to whether the intention of the phrase is the defiling of the entire city, or just the Temple precinct itself. See L. Schiffman, “*Ir ha-Miqdash* and Its Meaning in the Temple Scroll and Other Qumran Texts,” in *Sanctity of Time and Space in Tradition and Modernity* (eds. A. Houtman, M. J. H. M. Poorthuis, and J.

filled with many concrete entities, neither is a concrete entity in and of itself. Thus it follows that the Sabbath, also a non-concrete entity, was thought to have possessed a temporally defined purity.⁶⁹ Failure to maintain oneself in a state of ritual purity would “defile” the Sabbath – a covenantal breach deemed so severe as to merit death (at least according to *Jubilees*).

VIII. Rabbinic Literature

The categorical association of the Sabbath with ritual purity is nowhere to be found in rabbinic literature, this despite an exegetical awareness of the Sabbath-Temple-Eden matrix.⁷⁰ In the rabbinic understanding, God indeed sanctified the Sabbath, but there is no recorded imperative for one to actively sanctify the day. As for the biblical language that would imply such an imperative, Westermann’s remarks capture the general rabbinic attitude: “People ‘sanctify’ the day by observing it; they desecrate it by doing forbidden work on that day.”⁷¹ Sanctification is thus just another way of expressing “lack of desecration.” At the more granular level, the biblical language of sanctity is channeled into halakhic practices that have little, if any, cultic import. Thus the commandment to “Remember the sabbath day and *sanctify* it” (Exod 20:8) is interpreted as prescribing the ritual later known as *qiddush*, which blesses God who sanctified the Sabbath.⁷²

In certain respects, this approach, which distances the Sabbath from cultic law, comports well with the post-destruction provenance of rabbinic texts. As Art Green has written of this period, “The Sabbath gradually supplanted the Temple as the central unifying religious symbol of the Jewish people.”⁷³ Yet as I will demonstrate below, there are suggestive and previously unrecognized remnants of the association of the Sabbath with ritual purity that are incom-

Schwartz; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 95–109; E. Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 141–44.

69 Interestingly, in one instance, Doering (“Purity and Impurity,” 269) regards the sanctity of the Sabbath as spatially driven.

70 On Sabbath-Temple, see below. Numerous rabbinic traditions play up the association of the creation narrative with the Temple; see, e.g., Tanhuma, *Pequdei* 2; Pesiqta de-Rav Kahana [Buber 5b–6a]; and see A. Green, “Sabbath as Temple: Some Thoughts on Space and Time in Judaism,” in *Go and Study: Essays and Studies in Honor of Alfred Jospe* (eds. R. Jospe and S. Z. Fishman; Washington, DC: B’nai B’rith Hillel Foundations, 1980), 287–305, 295–96. On the association in kabbalistic and hasidic literature, see *ibid.*, 297–303. According to Genesis Rabbah (16:5) Adam was instructed with the details of the sacrificial cult, and in a subsequent text (34:9), Adam is said to have offered his sacrifice on the “great altar in Jerusalem.” Additionally, a number of aggadic traditions in the Bavli relate Adam’s having offered animal sacrifice; see *b. Shab.* 28b; *b. Avod. Zar.* 8a; *b. Hul.* 60b.

71 Westermann, *Genesis*, 172. See also Andreasen, *Old Testament Sabbath*, 205–6.

72 See, e.g., Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, Yitro *ba-Hodesh* 7 [Horovitz-Rabin p. 229]; *b. Pesah.* 106a; cf. Mekhilta de-Rabbi Simeon b. Yohai, 20:8.

73 Green, “Sabbath as Temple,” 293.

prehensible without a previous appreciation of the Sabbath-purity laws in sectarian literature.

Ironically, the rabbis were quite well attuned to the repeated biblical insinuations of a connection between the Sabbath and the Temple. Thus numerous rabbinic texts grapple with the question of how the Temple is to operate on the Sabbath, when numerous aspects of the sacrificial service (e. g., kindling of fire, animal slaughter) necessitate the performing of otherwise prohibited labors.⁷⁴ Indeed, the earliest text to exempt the Temple from Sabbath restrictions plays on the placement of an injunction to observe the Sabbath in the midst of a sea of instructions for constructing the Tabernacle.⁷⁵ Yet other legal midrashic texts make the point that despite this operational exemption, the Tabernacle/Temple was not to be constructed on the Sabbath.⁷⁶ Finally, in later rabbinic texts, the 39 prohibited labors themselves are said to have been derived from those labors that were performed in the construction of the Tabernacle.⁷⁷ In other words, in rabbinic literature, the best developed associations between Sabbath and Temple relate only to various aspects of prohibited labor.

Thus, the rabbinic tradition stands in sharp contrast with the works surveyed above which appear to have taken a strong reading of the Sabbath-Temple matrix in fashioning a demand for ritual purity.⁷⁸ That said, there are perhaps echoes of the sectarian purity tradition embedded within rabbinic texts. For example, the 39 prohibited labors are divided into a taxonomy of *avot* and *toladot*. As Sidney Hoenig notes, these categorizations derive from the world of ritual purity.⁷⁹ On a more theoretical plane, David Kraemer approaches the system of *muqṭseh* as “partially analogous to the ‘purity map’ of the world of the Temple.”⁸⁰ Indeed, Kraemer refers to objects that one is forbidden from handling as “Sabbath-impure.”⁸¹

74 That the Temple is an exempted “island” when it comes to the observance of the Sabbath was seized upon for polemical purposes by Justin Martyr; see D. Rokeah, *Justin Martyr and the Jews* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 51 and notes. See also Matt 12:3–8.

75 Mekhilta, *Va-Yaqhel* 1 [Horovitz, p. 345]

76 E. g., Sifra *Qedoshim* 3:7; Sifre Numbers, *Pinhas* 144 [p. 192]. It is certainly noteworthy that in later rabbinic texts, the focus is moved toward the perpetuity of the Temple’s holiness.

77 See *y. Shab.* 7:2 (9b); *b. Shab.* 49b.

78 David Kraemer sees in the rabbinic Sabbath boundary of 2,000 cubits a link with the 2,000 cubit boundary specified for the Levitical cities of refuge (Num 35:1–5). See *idem*, “The Sabbath as a Sanctuary in Space,” in *Tiferet Leyisrael: Jubilee Volume in Honor of Israel Francus* (eds. J. Roth, M. Schmelter, and Y. Francus; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 2010), 79–92, 84–85. For a more limited exposition on the (“asymmetrical”) relationship between rabbinic Sabbath and Temple, see J. Neusner, “Innovation Through Repetition: The Role of Scripture in the Mishnah’s Division of Appointed Times,” *History of Religions* 21 (1981): 48–76.

79 Hoenig, “Designated Number,” 196.

80 Kraemer, “Sabbath as Sanctuary,” 88.

81 *Ibid.*

A more concrete link between Sabbath and purity law may be found in Mishnah *Shabbat*.⁸² Although concerned primarily with those activities that are either permissible or prohibited when observing the Sabbath day, a concern for purity law is evident in some fifteen instances, which are interspersed evenly throughout the tractate (*m. Shab.* 1:3, 2:3, 2:6, 6:1, 6:4, 6:8 (x4), 9:1, 9:2, 9:3, 17:3, 21:1, 21:3).⁸³ At first glance, it would appear that these references to purity law may be placed into three rough categories: (a) those that are completely tangential, and have no substantive connection to Sabbath law; (b) those generated by an associative link to the preceding Sabbath material; and (c) those with ramifications for Sabbath law.

(a) Pronounced tangential references to purity law in Mishnah *Shabbat* are found with the opening of chapter 9 of the tractate. There we find a series of exegetically derived laws introduced with the interrogative מנין:

[1] Whence do we learn of an idol that like a menstruant it conveys uncleanness by carrying? ... [2] Whence do we learn of a ship that it is not susceptible to uncleanness? ... [3] Whence do we learn of a woman who emits semen on the third day that she is unclean?⁸⁴

Despite being situated in the heart of Mishnah *Shabbat*, the series of purity-related queries in this digression has no observable connection with Sabbath law. Its seemingly intrusive presence in the tractate did not appear to bother the rabbis of the Talmud, although it did draw the notice of the medieval commentators.⁸⁵

82 Purity references are well-represented in the Tosefta as well; see, e.g., *t. Shab.* 1:14 (see S.S. Miller, *At the Intersection of Texts and Material Finds: Stepped Pools, Stone Vessels, and Ritual Purity among the Jews of Roman Galilee* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015], 171, 230), 5:7–8, 10:18, 13:17, 16:11. On the loaded statement (בוא וראה עד היכן פרצה) regarding general adherence to purity laws in 1:14, see Y. Adler, “Tosefta Shabbat 1:14 – ‘Come and See the Extent to Which Purity Had Spread’: An Archaeological Perspective on the Historical Background to a Late Tannaitic Passage,” in *Talmuda de-Eretz Israel: Archaeology and the Rabbis in Late Antique Palestine* (eds. S. Fine and A.J. Koller; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 63–96. On *t. Shab.* 16:11, see Miller, *At the Intersection*, 164–65.

83 Interestingly, other portions of Mishnah *Shabbat* have neither a substantive nor implied connection to Sabbath law. For example, a chapter-long (ch. 19) series of laws relating to circumcision is perhaps the most notable digression in the tractate. A close relationship between Sabbath and circumcision law is evident in Jubilees as well, where these are the only two commandments that are said explicitly to have been given to the angels (*Jub.* 2:18; 15:27). See Segal, *Jubilees*, 239.

84 H. Danby, *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933), 108.

85 Thus Rashi (*b. Shab.* 82a, s.v. *Amar Rabbi Aqiva*) posits that the larger digressive unit was included on account of the exegetical teaching in the middle of 9:3, which is likewise opened with the interrogative מנין. This teaching permits the bathing of a baby on the third day after circumcision, even if it is the Sabbath. Goldberg, *Commentary to the Mishna: Shabbat* (Jerusalem: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1976), 179, adopts the position of Tosafot (loc. cit.), who notes that the prior chapter (8) ends with a proof-text from Isaiah ch. 30 (v. 14), and the first of the teachings in Chapter 9 is likewise derived from a verse in the same chapter (v. 22).

(b) In addition to the above are those prescriptions which, while having a closer association with surrounding Sabbath law, do not themselves have any practical import for Sabbath observance. This class of purity provisions includes the prohibition (1:3) against a man with a sexual discharge (*zav*) from eating together with a woman with a sexual discharge (*zavah*).⁸⁶ Falling under a similar rubric are the statements that (a) tree-derived materials do not contract the impurity of Tents (*tum'at ohel*; 2:3); (b) that a woman should not immerse herself in a ritual bath unless she has loosened specific types of headbands (6:1); and (c) a prosthesis which has a “cavity for pads” is susceptible to impurity (6:8). These statements are all surrounded by, and are made in close connection with, Sabbath law, but their implications for Sabbath law are tenuous, if at all extant.

(c) The majority of the purity laws articulated in Mishnah *Shabbat*, however, are adduced in (putatively) closer connection with Sabbath law. In these instances, the juxtaposition of the two insinuates – although never makes explicit – that purity law is a variable with implications for the permissibility of certain activities on the Sabbath.

This interrelationship is seemingly manifest in the case of a “wick made from [a piece of] cloth that was twisted but not singed” (2:3). According to R. Eliezer, such a wick is susceptible to impurity and may not be used for a Sabbath lamp, while according to R. Aqiva, the wick is not susceptible to impurity and may be lit for the Sabbath.⁸⁷ In other words, this case buttresses the notion of a correspondence between purity status and the permissibility of specific materials for Sabbath kindling. The implication is that only kindling that is *impervious* to impurity may be lit for the Sabbath.

It would appear that susceptibility to impurity also has implications for the permissibility of carrying and handling various objects on the Sabbath. Thus we find in Mishnah *Shabbat* 6:4 that a garter is *pure* (i. e., *not* susceptible to impurity) and may (thus?) be worn while “going out,” while anklets are *impure* (i. e., susceptible to impurity) and may (thus?) not be worn while “going out.”⁸⁸ While the Mishnah does not elaborate on this connection any further, a surface reading would seem to imply that only “pure” objects which are not susceptible to ritual impurity are permitted to be worn, handled, or carried on

86 The Mishnah even signals that this provision is an intrusion – albeit one generated by a legal-theoretical principle similar to that of the preceding Sabbath laws – by employing the locution **ביוצא בו**.

87 According to Goldberg, however, the connection to purity law in this case is only incidental. See Goldberg, *Commentary*, 44.

88 An examination of the textual variants may help to shed light on this particular provision. According to the printed editions, the halakhah consists of two factual statements, connected by the conjunction prefixed to **ויוצאין**: (a) clarifying whether the object is susceptible to impurity (**בירית טהורה**), and (b) stating whether it is permissible to carry (**ויוצאין בה בשבת**). One might even see a causal relationship between the two statements. According to MS Kaufmann, however, **ויוצאין** lacks a conjunction, and leaves us with one statement, without implying any relationship between its parts.

the Sabbath.⁸⁹ This reading cannot be sustained, however, as all normatively defined garments (*beqed*) are susceptible to impurity, yet there is no question about the permissibility of wearing such garments when crossing from one domain to another. The seeming irrelevance of the purity status of these accessories troubled modern scholars, but there has yet to be a satisfactory solution to this problem.⁹⁰

Indeed, a short few lines later (6:8), three distinct cases relating to the accessories for an amputee's prostheses underscore the inconsistency in the relationship between Sabbath and im/purity, while notably also reengaging with the Sabbath-Temple connection. Thus on the one hand, (a) the cushions of a leg prosthesis *are* susceptible to (*midras*) impurity, and one *may* (nevertheless) "go out"⁹¹ with them on the Sabbath and/or enter the Temple court; on the other hand, (b) while the "seat of cushions" is likewise susceptible to (*midras*) impurity, one *may not* "go out" with it on the Sabbath and/or enter the Temple court;⁹² and finally, (c) the "wooden stumps [of arm amputees]" are *not* susceptible to impurity, and (nonetheless) one *may not* "go out" with them.⁹³ Moreover, in Mishnah *Shabbat* 17:3 and 21:3, it is stated that specific implements may be handled regardless of whether they are, or are not, susceptible to impurity (בין כך ובין כך ניטל בשבת).⁹⁴

89 Indeed, this appears to have been the practice of the Samaritan-Israelites; see below.

90 See, e.g., Goldberg, *Commentary*, 44, 110. Boaz Cohen goes so far as to contend that 6:4 and 6:8 "were originally not in this treatise [=Mishnah Shabbat], as they are primarily concerned with the law of impurity." He proceeds to argue that these passages originated in Mishnah *Kelim*; for if they originated in Mishnah *Shabbat*, they should have been formulated with the Sabbath concerns first and the purity concerns second. See B. Cohen, *Mishnah and Tosefta: A Comparative Study*, Part I: Shabbat (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1935), 89 and n. 4.

91 As with 6:4, here too MS Kaufmann lacks conjunctions before וּבְנִסְתִּין and יֵוצֵאִין. Note also the substantive, halakhic difference in MS Kaufmann. See Goldberg (*Commentary*, 119), who ascribes this to a scribal error (see below note). Epstein, on the other hand, points to the "sterility" of the marginal gloss (i.e., the fact that the secondary hand did not tamper with the Mishnah itself), and is of the opinion that the glossator followed an extant manuscript tradition that agreed with the variant in MS Kaufmann. See J. N. Epstein, *Introduction to the Mishnaic Text*, I (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2000), 284 (Hebrew).

92 This provision appears as a (secondary?) marginal note in MS Kaufmann, with the omission probably owing to homoioteleuton.

93 The Tosefta that is roughly parallel to our Mishnah (~5:7–8) interestingly provides yet additional cases where the purity status of given objects is clarified. Goldberg presents a useful chart of these in his *Commentary*, 121.

94 We should note the two different ways in which the Mishnah formulates susceptibility to impurity; in all but 17:3 and 21:3, the Mishnah merely says טְהוּרָה or טְמֵאָה and leaves us to fill in the blanks. In 17:3 and 21:3, however, the Mishnah uses a "fuller" language: מִקְבֵּל טְמֵאָה. It is also of note that these two mishnayot are linguistically connected with the בין כך formula. Might this indicate separate sources, or perhaps disparate meanings? Might the use of טְהוּרָה/טְמֵאָה, as in 6:4 and 6:8 be a categorical statement regarding the purity status of the object, rather than a statement regarding its susceptibility to impurity? I.e., is the Mishnah telling us that, say, an anklet is susceptible to impurity, or that an anklet has

If there is no substantive or systematic relationship between Sabbath and purity law, why then is the latter continually invoked in Mishnah *Shabbat*? While this question is most acute with regard to the aforementioned tangents in categories (a) and (b), one might argue that with regard to category (c) the Mishnah is engaging in a legal-conceptual thought experiment – specifically one that interrogates the varying definitions of what constitutes a *keli*. A guiding premise in Mishnah *Shabbat* is that a *keli*, a halakhically-defined “artifact” (to use Mira Balberg’s translation), may be handled on the Sabbath (17:1).⁹⁵ As the most fundamental heuristic for qualifying as a *keli* is the artifact’s susceptibility to impurity,⁹⁶ it is certainly sensible for Mishnah *Shabbat* to be interested in questions of purity-status. Indeed, with the above-noted inconsistency the Mishnah has demonstrated that the definition of *keli* is dynamic, and what is a *keli* for the purposes of Sabbath law is not necessarily so in the realm of purity law. Left unresolved, however, is why the definition of *keli* should not be universal,⁹⁷ and why there is no evidence of this thought-experiment in Mishnah *Kelim*, which is otherwise filled with a dizzying array of tests and criteria defining the parameters for what constitutes a *keli*.⁹⁸

Consequently, despite the repeated invocations of purity law in Mishnah *Shabbat*, there is nevertheless no *systematic* connection between purity status and Sabbath law. How are we to interpret this seeming preoccupation of the tractate with purity law, particularly given that a majority of the purity provisions have no direct or indirect connection to the Sabbath?⁹⁹ Having illustrated above how numerous ancient Jewish writers viewed the Sabbath as possessing and demanding temporal purity, and as capable of being defiled, the preoccupation with purity law in Mishnah *Shabbat* seems more reasonable. I would argue, consequently, that the dispersal of purity law references

intrinsic impure status? The brevity of the Mishnah’s language in the earlier cases might point to the latter possibility.

95 See M. Balberg, *Purity, Body, and Self in Early Rabbinic Literature* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014), 74.

96 For a deeper discussion of the criteria which determine this susceptibility, see Balberg, *Purity*, 78–95.

97 Compare a similar lack of overlap in a series of cases in *m. Toh.* 6:6–10, where what is considered a private domain with regard to Sabbath law is considered a public domain for the purposes of purity law.

98 While there are mentions of Sabbath law in Mishnah *Kelim*, the provisions in 17:11 and 18:2 are adduced with no connection whatsoever to purity law. The case of Sabbath-status of a door-bolt in 11:4 is juxtaposed to a discussion of its purity status, but a connection between the two is nowhere insinuated.

99 A similar preoccupation with purity law is present in Mishnah *Shevu’ot*, the first two chapters of which feature an overwhelming proportion of purity-related issues. Further underscoring this connection between Mishnah *Shabbat* and Mishnah *Shevu’ot* is the fact that both tractates open with identical “two which are four” formulae. While Goldberg (and a host of others) are of the opinion that the formula opening *Shabbat* is secondary, and “originated” in the list with which Mishnah *Shevu’ot* opens, the association of both tractates with a host of tangential purity laws should invite further speculation. See Goldberg, *Commentary*, 4; see also Cohen, *Mishnah and Tosefta*, 66–67.

throughout this particular tractate should be viewed as vestigial corroboration for the long standing association of purity law and the Sabbath.¹⁰⁰

Thus we might postulate that with its eclectic positions on the matter, Mishnah *Shabbat* reflects the notion that purity law has no bearing whatsoever on Sabbath law. We find this stance reflected in the locution *בין כך ובין כך* *ניטל בשבת*, which is employed in Mishnah *Shabbat* 17:3 and 21:3 to indicate that something is permissible to carry/handle *regardless* of its susceptibility to impurity. This statement could be interpreted as a negative response to those who might make the former contingent upon the latter. The putative purity tangents in Mishnah *Shabbat* function, consequently, as a witness to an earlier series of traditions which insinuated a more coherent, systematic relationship between ritual purity and Sabbath law.¹⁰¹

IX. Rabbinic Countertexts?

Practices which appear, at first glance, to tilt toward the sectarian ritualization of the Sabbath-Temple-Eden paradigm are scattered throughout rabbinic literature, with a noteworthy concentration in amoraic texts. Perhaps the most widely cited case is the custom of pre-Sabbath ablutions practiced by R. Judah b. Ela'i (*b. Shab.* 25b):¹⁰²

Such was the custom (*minhag*) of R. Judah b. Ela'i: on the eve of the Sabbath they would bring to him a basin full of hot water, and he would wash (וְרוּחֵץ) his face, hands, and feet, and he would wrap himself and sit in [a garment of] fringed linens, and he was like an angel of the Lord of Hosts.

These ablutions, which are understood by the Bavli as evidence that it is a meritorious practice to wash oneself in hot water before the Sabbath (*b. Shab.*

100 Additional evidence of this preoccupation may be found in the Bavli. Thus *b. Shab.* 91a-b has Rava inquire of Rav Nahman as to the law in a case where “one throws an olive’s worth of *terumah* into an impure house.” Given the open-ended nature of the inquiry and the fact that there are multiple statuses in question, the anonymous layer of the Talmud wishes to clarify whether Rava wished to know the ramifications of such an action with respect to Sabbath law or with respect to purity law. This question ultimately remains unresolved after some back-and-forth. Yet, as Tosafot and other medieval commentators noted, the query could not possibly have been with regard to Sabbath law, as the purity status of the house is irrelevant to Sabbath law.

101 See, e.g., V. Noam, “Traces of Sectarian Halakhah in the Rabbinic World,” in *Rabbinic Perspectives*, 67–85. Magen Broshi has argued that the rabbinic exhortation to have marital relations on the Sabbath (e.g., *b. B. Qam.* 82b; *b. Ket.* 65b; *b. Nid.* 38b) implicitly engages with sectarian prohibitions against sexual intercourse on the Sabbath, such as that in *Jub.* 50:8: “Any man who desecrates this day (= the Sabbath), who lies with a woman ... is to die.” See M. Broshi, “Anti-Qumranic Polemics in the Talmud,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress; Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, March 1991*, vol. II. (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 589–600, esp. 596–97. See also Doering, “Purity Regulations,” 605–6. On the problematic nature of the Sabbath code in *Jubilees* ch. 50, see above, n. 25.

102 See Gilat, *Studies*, 302–3; Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 447–48.

25b), seemingly align with the purity framework seen in sectarian texts. Taken together with other rabbinic texts which prescribe that one must wear clean clothing on the Sabbath, or that one must otherwise have clothing that is reserved for wearing solely on the Sabbath, we continue to amass ostensible parallels with the sectarian sanctification practices.¹⁰³

Despite the presence of such suggestive rituals, however, a closer examination of these – and other – rabbinic texts reveals a clear divergence from the sanctifying-purifying practices of the sectarian world. First, the rabbinic pre-Sabbath ablutions and washing are invoked with the “*secular*” verb of רחץ, which denotes hygienic cleansing, rather than ritual immersion.¹⁰⁴ Second, and more importantly, neither this non-ritual cleansing nor the wearing of clean and/or special garments is invoked within a legal or exegetical framework that anchors these practices in the biblical sanctification of the Sabbath – this despite the repeated biblical mentions of Sabbath sanctification, and notwithstanding the clear rabbinic recognition, demonstrated above, of the connection between Sabbath and Temple. In this respect it is quite telling that the practice of wearing of special garments for the Sabbath is grounded in the imperative to *honor* (כבוד), but not to sanctify, the Sabbath.¹⁰⁵

Whereas the rabbis did not require that ritual purity be maintained on the Sabbath, we do find a lone teaching that mandates a pre-Festival ritual immersion (*b. Rosh ha-Shan.* 16b):

Rabbi Isaac said: One is obligated to purify himself for (or ‘on’) the Festivals, as it is written, “And their carcasses you shall not touch” (Lev 11:8).

According to Alon, this sanctification relates both to the inevitable association of the festivals with pilgrimage and entry to the Sanctuary, as well as to the inherent sanctity of the festival days.¹⁰⁶ As for Alon’s latter point, numerous rabbinic texts speak of other ritual practices which sanctify the Festival days – practices which I have argued we do not find with regard to the Sabbath. Thus as an exegetical response to a frequent association between sanctity and the Festivals in the repeated biblical locution מקרא קודש, we find contextual variations of the following legal homily attested in four of the Tannaitic halakhic midrashim:¹⁰⁷

103 For a comprehensive overview of the sources, see Gilat, *Studies*, 303–4.

104 So Alon, “The Halacha in Barnabae Epistula,” 34, n. 28. On the problematic nature of using hot water for ritual bathing, see *b. Hul.* 106a.

105 See *b. Shab.* 113a.

106 See Alon, “Levitical Cleanliness,” 204; see also Gilat, *Studies*, 303. A similar, unattributed teaching is recorded in the Sifra, *Shemini* 2:9 (ed. Weiss), according to which one may not touch an unclean reptile on a festival.

107 See Mekhilta de-Rabbi Simeon b. Yohai, Exodus 12:16 (Epstein-Melamed p. 18); Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, *Pisha* 9 (Horovitz-Rabin, p. 30); Sifra *Emor* 12:14:4; Sifre *Pinhas* 147 (Horovitz, p. 194). See C. Albeck, *Untersuchungen über die halakischen Midraschim* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1927), 2; Gilat, *Studies*, 303 n. 13.

ביום הראשון מקרא קודש: קדשהו. וביום השמיני מקרא קדש: קדשהו. במה אתה מקדשו? במאכל ובמשתה ובכסות נקייה:

On the first day is a sacred occasion: sanctify it. And on the eighth day is a sacred occasion: sanctify it. And with what does one sanctify it? With food and drink and with clean garments.

While this ritual triad of food, drink, and clean garments is eminently recognizable to us from practices that are enjoined for the *Sabbath*, rabbinic texts associate these rituals with the sanctification of the *Festivals*. In fact, the sole source that associates these practices with the sanctification of the Sabbath is a lone, *secondary* transposition of the above homily regarding sanctification of the Festivals.¹⁰⁸ And even then, this latter midrash invokes this dislocated teaching as an alternative (דבר אחר) to its primary understanding of the imperative to sanctify the Sabbath, which is the ritual of *qiddush*.¹⁰⁹

Lost exegetical opportunities for cementing a connection between Sabbath and active sanctification practices are evident elsewhere in rabbinic literature. A homily in *Genesis Rabbah* understands the imperative for sanctifying the Sabbath of Exodus as referring not to sanctification practices, but to the punning betrothal (*qiddushin*) of the Sabbath to the Israelites.¹¹⁰ Rabbinic liturgy for the Sabbath also seemingly avoids making the People of Israel the subject of the imperative to sanctify the Sabbath. This move is on prominent display in the opening of the *Amidah* for the Sabbath evening prayer: “You have sanctified the seventh day for [the sake of] Your name (לשמך).” Aharon Shemesh has rightly argued that the use of לשמך emphasizes God’s *own* sanctification of the Sabbath – this to the exclusion of the notion that the Sabbath is to be sanctified by the Israelites’ observance of the day.¹¹¹ A similar move is likewise evident, albeit in less tendentious fashion, in the closing benediction formula for the Sabbath *Amidah*: “Blessed are You, God, Who sanctifies the Sabbath.”

Nowhere is this avoidance more evident or explicit than in a discussion of the appropriate closing benediction formula for a Sabbath which coincides with a Festival. The anonymous layer of the Bavli (*b. Bets.* 17a) expresses incredulity at the Palestinian closing formula of “Who has sanctified Israel, and

108 See Mekhilta de-Rabbi Simeon b. Yohai, Exodus 20:8 (Epstein-Melamed p. 149); cf. Song of Songs Rabbah 6:4 for a later variation of this teaching.

109 Of course, the Sabbath is, in one isolated instance (Lev 23:3) referred to as a מקרא קודש and spoken of as a Festival; see, e.g., K. W. Weyde, *The Appointed Festivals of YHWH: The Festival Calendar in Leviticus 23 and the Sukkot Festival in Other Biblical Texts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), ch. 1.

110 *Genesis Rabbah* 11 (Theodor-Albeck, pp. 95–96); A. Shemesh, “Who Sanctifies the Sabbath?” in *Jewish Culture in the Eye of the Storm: A Jubilee Book in Honor of Yosef Ahituv* (eds. A. Sagi and N. Ilan; Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 2002), 699–708, 705 (Hebrew). This teaching is invoked in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai, who elsewhere (*b. Bets.* 17a) is ascribed the teaching that the Sabbath was revealed to the Israelites in secret. On the history of the Sabbath-marriage motif, which was greatly amplified in the mystical tradition, see Ginsburg, *The Sabbath*, 101–21.

111 *Ibid.*, 706.

the Sabbath and Festivals” (מקדש ישראל והשבת והזמנים), objecting as follows: “Can the Israelites possibly sanctify the Sabbath? The Sabbath is sacred in and of itself!”¹¹² This response aptly captures the perception that, to the rabbinic mind, the people are to have no role in sanctifying the Sabbath, which was sanctified by God in perpetuity at the moment of its creation.

Thus, while echoes of the sectarian sanctification rituals reverberate here and there in rabbinic literature, they are systematically disengaged from the biblical imperatives for the Israelites to sanctify the Sabbath.¹¹³ This suppressive move is all the more surprising, considering that the rabbis are elsewhere quite sensitive to the exegetical matrix of Sabbath-Temple (and Temple-Eden).

Why the rabbis so assiduously avoid not only Sabbath sanctification rituals, but also attaching the biblical imperative of Sabbath sanctification to the people, is unclear. One possibility, mentioned above, is that with this ritual and exegetical avoidance, the rabbis were “responding,” albeit only between the lines, to sectarian Sabbath purity practices. Far from falling into oblivion after the destruction of the Temple along with the sectarian groups,¹¹⁴ these Sabbath purity practices may have been preserved by Jews in the western diaspora, where numerous Christian Latin writers refer to the Jewish observance of Friday (or a meal eaten on Friday at the onset of the Sabbath) as *cena pura* (lit.: “pure meal”).¹¹⁵ William Horbury contends that this curious locution arose from an awareness by Christians of the Jewish practice of pre-Sabbath ritual purification.¹¹⁶

112 This question by the Stam, while quite suggestive for our purposes here, requires a radical reading of the Palestinian blessing formula which understands “Israel,” rather than “God,” to be the subject of מקדש. See also the variant manuscript readings of this passage, e.g., MS Vatican 109.

113 There is a certain oscillation in the biblical texts between God as sanctifier of the Sabbath and the imperative for the people to sanctify the day. A similar tension is recorded with regard to the Festivals; see *b. Bets.* 15b, which contrasts Deut 17:8 with Num 29:35. Cf. the case of circumcision of the heart: Deut 10:16 commands the Israelites to circumcise their hearts, and Deut 30:6 states that God will perform this action.

114 See, e.g., S.J.D. Cohen, “The Significance of Yavneh: Pharisees, Rabbis, and the End of Jewish Sectarianism,” *HUCA* 55 (1984): 27–53 (= *idem*, *The Significance of Yavneh and Other Essays in Jewish Hellenism* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], 44–70). For more recent views on post-destruction sectarianism, see, e.g., M. Goodman, “Sadducees and Essenes after 70 CE,” in *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder* (eds. S.E. Porter, P. Joyce, and D.E. Orton; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 347–56; J. Magness, “Sectarianism Before and After 70 CE,” in *Was 70 CE a Watershed in Jewish History? On Jews and Judaism before and after the Destruction of the Second Temple* (eds. D.R. Schwartz and Z. Weiss in collaboration with R.A. Clements; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 69–90; J.E. Burns, “Essene Sectarianism and Social Differentiation in Judea after 70 C.E.,” *HTR* 99 (2006): 247–74.

115 There is a long history of debates on the meaning of *cena pura*; see, most recently, Horbury, *Herodian Judaism*, 104–40. See also E. R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, V:1 (New York: Pantheon Books, 1956), 42–47.

116 Horbury, *Herodian Judaism*, 129–34. On intimate knowledge of Jewish Sabbath practices among the Church Fathers, see S.J.D. Cohen, “Sabbath Law and Mishnah Shabbat in

While the resemblances posited by Horbury between the Jewish *cena pura* and Christian Lord's Supper (*cena dominicana*) are debatable,¹¹⁷ it is certainly noteworthy that the notion of Sabbath purification finds manifestation in early Christian writings. Thus we find in the *Epistle of Barnabas* (ca. 130 C. E.) record of the following imperative (15:1,6): "Make the Sabbath of the Lord holy (ἀγιάσατε), with pure hands and a pure heart."¹¹⁸ Despite the polemical-typological thrust of Barnabas' larger message on the futility – indeed, impossibility – of Sabbath observance,¹¹⁹ this passage was seen by Alon (and later by Horbury) as yet an additional external witness to the exegetical outlook which generated Sabbath purification rites.¹²⁰ Indeed, Barnabas' mention of "with pure hands and a pure heart" almost certainly draws on LXX Ps 23:4 (MT 24:4) – which is itself a response to the Psalter's question as to who may enter the Temple (v. 3): "Who shall ascend the hill of the LORD? And who shall stand in his holy place?"¹²¹

X. Samaritan Literature

Explicit evidence for the coherence of the relationship between Sabbath and purity may be found in writings about the Dustan sect (or Dosithean movement) of the Samaritan-Israelites, for whom the susceptibility to impurity of artifacts had significant practical import for Sabbath observance.¹²² Thus, in a

Origen *De Principiis*," JSQ 17:2 (2010): 160–89; *idem*, "Dancing, Clapping, Meditating: Jewish and Christian Observance of the Sabbath in Pseudo-Ignatius," in *Judaea-Palaestina, Babylon and Rome: Jews in Antiquity* (eds. B. Isaac and Y. Shahar; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 29–51.

117 Horbury, *Herodian Judaism*, 137–38.

118 Translation from B. Ehrman (ed. and trans.), *The Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 2. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003), 67. According to Horbury (*Herodian Judaism*, 130–31), Barnabas is here conflating the "Fourth Commandment" with LXX Ps 23(24):4: ἀθῶς χερσὶν καὶ καθαρὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ. As noted by Rhodes, however, while "Barnabas gives the appearance of appealing directly to the Decalogue, the form in which he cites the Sabbath command shows surprisingly little verbal correspondence to either Exodus 20:8 or Deut. 5:12." See J. N. Rhodes, *The Epistle of Barnabas and the Deuteronomic Tradition* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 69; A. E. Cairus, "Sabbath and Covenant in the Epistle of Barnabas," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 39 (Spring 2001): 117–23, esp. 119–20.

119 See Rhodes, *Epistle*, 69–71; W. H. Shea, "The Sabbath in the Epistle of Barnabas," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 4 (1966): 149–75; R. J. Bauckham, "Sabbath and Sunday in the Post-Apostolic Church," in *From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Investigation* (ed. D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1982), 251–98, esp. 262–69.

120 Alon, "The Halacha in *Barnabae Epistula*," 32–34. Cf. Güdemann, according to whom Barnabas is referring to the pre-Sabbath bathing of R. Judah b. Ilai, noted above. See M. Güdemann, *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien* (Leipzig: O. Leiner, 1876), 126.

121 See Rhodes, *Epistle*, 69 n. 115.

122 Scholars dispute whether the Dustan sect and the followers of Dositheus are the same group, and how these should be dated; but these questions are beyond the scope of our current examination. The standard treatment is S. J. Isser, *The Dositheans: A Samaritan*

list of the legal-ritual stringencies and peculiarities of the sect(s), the mid-14th century C.E. Samaritan chronicle of *Kitab al-Tarikh of Abu 'L-Fath* reports the following:

On the Sabbath they would not permit eating or drinking out of copper or glass vessels, or from anything that could be purified once it became unclean – but only from vessels that cannot be purified once they become unclean.¹²³

In effectively prohibiting the use on the Sabbath of an entire class of vessels on the basis of their susceptibility to impurity, this stricture – unlike the Mishnah – provides a pragmatic explanation for an overarching concern with the purity status of various artifacts in the context of Sabbath law. Alan Crown, however, disputes this explanation:

This prohibition seems to be unrelated to matters of purity: rather it seems to be related to the possibility that there might be a temptation to purify these vessels after eating. Hence only vessels that could not be purified were used for food on the Sabbath.¹²⁴

Crown's explanation makes the Dustan/Dosithean law roughly analogous to rabbinic Sabbath law, which likewise appears to prohibit the purification of vessels on the Sabbath – this as a function not of purity law, but of the more general problem of effecting a repair by changing the entity's status.¹²⁵

Yet the specificity of the Samaritan case, which revolves around food and drink, seems to be a rather roundabout way to express a wider prohibition against the purification on the Sabbath of impure vessels. Moreover, it seems rather unlikely that Dustan/Dositheans would prohibit eating from certain types of vessels lest one come to violate the Sabbath by purifying them, but then go on to permit the use only of earthenware vessels (which “cannot be purified once they become unclean”). These too should be prohibited, lest one violate the Sabbath by resorting to breaking them – the sole “remedy” for such vessels if they become impure (Lev 6:21, 11:33)! Consequently, I would argue that the precise technicalities of this Dustan/Dosithean practice may have been lost in the process of their transmission to Abu 'L-Fath.¹²⁶ If the Dustan/Dositheans were concerned – as were the Samaritans at large (see below) – for

Sect in Late Antiquity (Leiden: Brill, 1976). See also J. Fossum, “Sects and Movements,” in *The Samaritans* (ed. A. D. Crown; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989), 293–389, esp. 293–332.

123 Abū al-Fath, *The Kitāb Al-Tarikh of Abu 'L-Fath* (trans. P. Stenhouse; Sydney, Australia: Mandelbaum Trust, University of Sidney, 1985), 111.

124 A. D. Crown, “Qumran, Samaritan Halakha and Theology and Pre-Tannaitic Judaism,” in *Boundaries of the Ancient Near Eastern World* (eds. M. Lubetski, C. Gottlieb, and S. Keller; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 420–41, 436. See also Fossum, “Sects,” 314–15.

125 See *t. Shab.* 16:11 and the discussion in Miller, *At the Intersection*, 164–65.

126 Kohler long ago issued a similar caveat regarding the reliability of Abu 'L-Fath's information on the Dustan/Dositheans, urging “allowance for inaccuracies due to hearsay reports.” See K. Kohler, “Dositheus, the Samaritan Heresiarch, and His Relations to Jewish and Christian Doctrines and Sects: (A Study of Professor Schechter's Recent Publication),” *The American Journal of Theology* 15 (1911): 404–35, 413. See also the comments in Isser, *Dositheans*, 74–75.

maintaining a state of ritual purity over the Sabbath, it is sensible that they would demand that one dine specifically on vessels impervious to impurity (e.g., stoneware). Such a precaution would serve to rule out a possible source of defilement, thereby offering further assurance that one's purity status not be compromised on the Sabbath.

A concern for ritual purity on the Sabbath is likewise evident in other practices of both the Dustan/Dositheans and the "mainstream" Samaritan community. In subsequent remarks on the observances of the followers of Dusis, the founder of the eponymous sect(s), Abu 'L-Fath remarks that in addition to not going from "house to house on the Sabbath day," they "did not even take their hands out of their sleeves."¹²⁷ Weiss suggests that this practice served as yet an additional precaution against contracting impurity on the Sabbath.¹²⁸ Additionally, Yusuf bin Salamah's mid-eleventh century C. E. legal work *Kitab al-Kafi* emphasizes the ample biblical grounds for the Samaritan prohibitions against marital intercourse on the Sabbath:

God made the Sabbath holy, and ordained for its holiness the hallowing of bodies and clothing ... And as it is ascribed to God (Exalted is He), it is not possible to do anything on it (i. e. the day) or that anything should occur on it to cause any change in it, such as copulation or anything else.¹²⁹

The *Kitab al-Kafi's* exposition on this prohibition appears to reflect the metonymical reading of Sabbath sanctity described above, which understands sanctity as purity. Indeed, the work gives further expression to this reading with a demand for pre-Sabbath purification:

And it is necessary that [the Sabbath] should be preceded by the hallowing of the souls and bodies, as God (Exalted is He) mentioned the hallowing of souls before mentioning it. Thus He said, "You shall be holy, for I (the Lord thy God) am holy," down to his saying "And keep my Sabbaths," and there cannot be hallowing unless there is no copulation ...¹³⁰

Thus the clearest and most unequivocal expression of the imperative to maintain the Sabbath in a state of ritual purity is generated by a strong reading of the sanctity of the Sabbath.

127 Abu 'L-Fath, 169 [Stenhouse, p. 219]. See also Isser, *Dositheans*, 102.

128 Weiss, "Sabbath Among the Samaritans," 261–62.

129 For text and translation, see Dorreya M. 'Abd al-'Al, "A Comparative Study of the Unedited Work of Abu'l-Hasan al-Suri and Yusuf ibn Salamah" (Ph. D. diss., University of Leeds [Glasgow], 1958), 538–39. See also Weiss, "Sabbath Among the Samaritans," 261. Similar remarks are found in an additional mid-eleventh century CE Samaritan legal work, entitled *Kitab al-Tabbakh*. On larger Samaritan concerns and stringencies regarding ritual purity, see I. R. M. M. Bóid, *Principles of Samaritan Halachah* (Leiden: Brill, 1989).

130 'Abd al-'Al, "A Comparative Study," 539–40. That sexual intercourse is at odds with biblical notions of holiness is a motif in Early Christian writing as well; see E. A. Clark, *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 215–24.

Moreover, Samaritan literature articulates a unique, *spatial* understanding of the Sabbath. A work known as both *Memar Marqa* and *Tibat Marqe*, a re-written and midrashic account of the Torah centering on Moses,¹³¹ describes the Sabbath as a “city entirely blessed” and a “place entirely sacred” (2.70).¹³² Samaritan liturgy for the Sabbath likewise expresses this motif in vivid fashion, with additional linkage to Eden: “the Sabbath is likened to a city/built at the end of Creation”; “a beautiful Garden is the Sabbath day”; “A Garden which will never close is the Sabbath”; “the seventh day is a beautiful city”; “The seventh day is likened to the city of a king.”¹³³ Noting this liturgical motif, Bóid rightly connects it to the Sabbath strictures of the Dustan/Dositheans:

If the Sabbath is in some way or other a place, then it is just as holy a place as the Tent of Meeting, and whatever requirements of purity apply to a person who enters one, apply to a person who enters the other.¹³⁴

Neither Marqe nor the Samaritan liturgy makes *explicit* mention of the Temple in this context.¹³⁵ Nevertheless, given how large the Tabernacle/Temple looms in biblical Sabbath texts and the demonstrated purity-related Sabbath laws

-
- 131 As with much of the canon of Samaritan literature, there is little certainty as to the dating of the composition. Marqe himself, the supposed author of the work, would have lived in the second half of the fourth century C.E., although the exact dating of his life is likewise contested. According to Ze'ev Ben-Hayyim “only the first book and several parts of the second were transmitted in the language that can be safely ascribed to Marqe’s times, while other parts of Tibat Marqe, although containing old traditions, were contaminated in various degrees.” See Z. Ben-Hayyim, “The Language of Tibat Marqe and Its Time,” in *Proceedings of the First International Congress of the Société D’études Samaritaines* (ed. A. Tal and M. Florentin; Tel-Aviv: Chaim Rosenberg School for Jewish Studies, Tel-Aviv University, 1991), 331–45; esp. 331–32. Cf. J. Macdonald, *Memar Marqah: The Teaching of Marqah*, vol. I (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1963), XX.
- 132 Z. Ben-Hayyim, ed. and trans., *Tibat Marqe* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1988), 122–25 (Hebrew; my translation).
- 133 Z. Ben-Hayyim, *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans*, III:2 (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1967), 280–87; A. E. Cowley, ed., *The Samaritan Liturgy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909), 69–70 (Hebrew; my translation).
- 134 Bóid, *Principles of Samaritan Halachah*, 343 n. 261. As I demonstrated, however, the Dustan/Dositheans were not the only Samaritans to observe purity related rituals and stringencies on/for the Sabbath.
- 135 Of course, the Samaritans would not be speaking of the Jerusalem Temple, which they view as a “late” development, and constituted an “adversarial, political, social, and religious response to the ancient centers [of worship] in the vicinity of Mt. Gerizim and Shechem.” See B. Tsedaka, *Ḳitsur Toldot Ha-Yiśre’elim Ha-Shomronim: Mi-Yetsi’at Mitsrayim Ye-ad Shenat 2000* (Holon: Mekhon A.B. le-limude Shomronut, 2001), 5–6 (my translation). This is to be contrasted with the cultural memory of the Jews – which we will not deal with here – which saw the Samaritans as foreigners who had been resettled in Samaria (2 Kgs 17:24) by the Assyrian king Shalmaneser. These foreigners then tried to stymie the attempt to build the Second Temple (Ezra 4). On the Jewish sources for the Samaritan schism, see I. Hjelm, *The Samaritans and Early Judaism: A Literary Analysis* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 13–51.

held by the Samaritans, this spatializing of the Sabbath is almost certainly to be related to the holiness of the Temple (and Temple city).

XI. Conclusion

Jewish writers in the Second Temple period accorded the Sabbath the sanctity with which it is consistently recorded in Scripture, and they understood the profaning/defiling of the Sabbath as an offense that violated the day's sacred/pure nature. In practical terms, they forestalled this violation by maintaining the day in a state of ritual purity, and quite possibly mandating that one undergo ritual immersion prior to the onset of the Sabbath. On the simplest level, I have demonstrated that this view was driven by an omnisignificant reading of the repeated mentions of Sabbath and sanctity as well as a metonymical understanding of "sanctity" and "profanation."

Yet the association between Sabbath and purity goes much deeper. Ancient readers both detected and put to use what I have called the Sabbath-Temple-Eden matrix, thereby imbuing the Sabbath with further ritual – indeed cultic – meaning. Entry into the Sabbath day was understood as demanding the same state of purity as entry into the Temple. The sacred time of the Sabbath was thus concretized and made violable. Another reification of this type is evident in the sectarian view that the entire city of Jerusalem was susceptible to impurity. Rather than a misapprehension of the biblical purity system, per Milgrom, this view maps organically onto the expansiveness of the Temple's hold over sacred space and sacred time in the sectarian world.¹³⁶

Rabbinic sources both recognized, and made use of, the same exegetical matrix which I argue impelled the requirement for Sabbath purity among the sectarians. Yet the "sanctification" of the Sabbath in rabbinic literature does not slide into the language of, and ritual countermeasures against, a state of impurity. To a certain extent, one could argue that the rabbis were utterly disengaged from the sectarian practice, which coheres with their comparatively less expansive view of the Temple's reach with regard to purity law.¹³⁷ I have demonstrated, however, how vestigial corroboration of concerns with Sabbath purity may be seen in the abundant mentions of purity law in Mishnah Shabbat – which, without this contextual framework, would prove inexplicable. For the rabbis, the connection between Sabbath and Temple only went so far as generating lists of forbidden labors. Ironically, the notion – so artfully spoken of by theologians – of the rabbinic Sabbath as a "Temple in time" best belongs to the world of the sectarians.¹³⁸

136 See Regev, *Sectarianism*, 141–47; D. Henshke, "The Sanctity of Jerusalem: The Sages and Sectarian Halakhah," *Tarbiz* 67 (1998): 5–28 (Hebrew).

137 See Regev, *Sectarianism*, 148–51.

138 See, e.g., A. J. Heschel, *The Sabbath* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Young, 1951), 15; Green, "Sabbath as Temple," 303.